

Appl. No. : 10/057,002  
Filed : January 24, 2002

## REMARKS

The foregoing amendments are responsive to the August 25, 2005 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

### Response to Rejection of Claim 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking insufficient antecedent basis for the term "trace information." Applicants have amended Claim 30 to recite "trace data" instead of "trace information."

Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of Claim 30.

### Amendments to Claims 3 and 20

Applicants have amended Claim 3 to depend from Claim 8 instead of Claim 1. Applicants have amended Claim 20 to depend directly from Claim 8 instead of through Claim 18.

### Response to Provisional Rejection of Claims 6-35 Under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected Claims 6-35 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,202,199 in view of U.S. 5,732,210 to Buzbee.

Applicants have filed herewith a terminal disclaimer listing U.S. Patent No. 6,202,199. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of Claims 6-35.

### Response to Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 5 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,265,254 to Blasciak.

Applicants have canceled Claims 1-2 and 5 in order to expedite allowance of the remaining claims. Applicants have amended Claim 3 to depend from Claim 8.

Appl. No. : 10/057,002  
Filed : January 24, 2002

Response to Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,265,254 to Blasciak in view of 6,321,375 Blandy.

Claim 3 depended from Claim 1 which has been canceled. Applicants have amended Claim 3 to depend from Claim 8.

Response to Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blasciak in view of Buzbee.

Applicants have canceled Claim 4 in order to expedite allowance of the remaining claims.

Summary

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3 and 6-36 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 3 and 6-36. If there are any remaining issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (949) 721-6305 or at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: October 25, 2005

By: Lee W Henderson  
Lee W. Henderson Ph.D.  
Registration No. 41,830  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

1966191  
093005